

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 03542pct	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/001337	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 13 February 2004 (13.02.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant OLYMPUS WINTER & IBE GMBH			

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).		
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.		
3.	This report contains indications relating to the following items:		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I	Basis of the report	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II	Priority	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application	
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).		

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Date of issuance of this report 14 August 2006 (14.08.2006)
	Authorized officer Agnes Wittmann-Regis e-mail: pt06@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 19 MAY 2004

WIPO

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/001337

International filing date (day/month/year)
13.02.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G02B23/24

Applicant
OLYMPUS WINTER & IBE GMBH

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Daffner, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7087



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/001337

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/001337

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:
- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).
 - ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).
- Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3,4
	No: Claims	1,2
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	3,4
	No: Claims	1,2
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-4
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item I

Basis of the opinion are the application documents as originally filed.

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 1 Claim 1 is unclear since it is not apparent what is the center of the set. It would appear that a center can be only defined for a symmetrical arrangement as defined in claim 2. For an asymmetrical arrangement no center is apparent. Furthermore the expression units is vague, since the grouping of a lens system in units appears to be arbitrary.
- 2 Accordingly the reader of claim 4 is left in doubt from which center the outermost lenses should be arranged at asymmetrical distances.

Apparently the center could be defined in relation to the remaining three symmetrically arranged units.

- 3 The relay set defined in claim 1 is anticipated by the relay set according to document D1 (JP 10-073 762).

Document D1 discloses a relay set 2 for the optical system of a rigid endoscope (see abstract), said optical system comprising (see fig. 4) an objective 1 at the distal end, an ocular 4 at the proximal end and between them a relay lens system 2 consisting of two half sets having the same lens units arranged in symmetrical sequence with respect to the center of the set (see fig. 4), each half set consists of four lens units having in the sequence of raising distance from the center the refracting powers Positive, Negative, Positive, Positive (see fig. 4).

The relay set is also anticipated by the relay set of document D2 (US 4 676 606, see figures 6 to 9).

- 4 The symmetrical arrangement defined in claim 2 is also anticipated by documents D1 (see fig. 4) and D2 (see figures 6 to 9).
- 5 Apparently there is no hint towards an asymmetrical arrangement of the outermost lens or a glass rod between the half sets as defined in claims 3 and 4.

It is noted that claim 3 is interpreted in the sense that the outermost lenses are asymmetrically arranged with respect to the center of the symmetrically arranged rest of the half sets.

* * * * *